

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks and arguments, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-37 are currently pending in this application, and the Examiner's allowance of Claims 16-37, and his indication that Claims 2, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 12-14 contain patentable subject matter, are noted with appreciation.

Claim 1, and its dependent Claims 3, 4, 6, 8 and 15, stand finally rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0101627 of Robinson et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Amended independent Claim 1 clarifies that the polygonally shaped "side surface section" recited therein extends completely around a longitudinal portion of the interior of the connector pin assembly body passage. In his January 13, 2006 final office action, the Examiner stated (on page 3, paragraph 4) that "Robinson [2003/0101627] still meets the claim language [of Claim 1] since the claim requires the side surface section **(which is not claimed as the entire opening of the passage)** to circumscribe the lock member and the detent".

Via amended independent Claim 1, each of applicants' finally rejected Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 15 now provides a more specific patentable structural distinction over the Robinson et al reference in a manner suggested by the Examiner. In this regard it should be noted that, as set forth in Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 15, applicants' recited polygonally shaped side surface section (for example side surface section 24b in applicants' drawings) extends completely around a longitudinal (i.e., lengthwise) portion of the interior of the connector pin body passage, while neither

of the laterally recessed side surface sections 72 and 75 in Robinson et al (see FIG. 5) extends completely around any longitudinal (i.e., lengthwise) portion of the interior 68 of the cartridge body 64.


It is thus respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1 and its finally rejected dependent Claims 3, 4, 6, 8 and 15 are patentably distinguishable over Robinson et al (2003/0101627). The Examiner is thanked for the courtesy extended to the undersigned attorney for applicants in a telephone conference today in which the Examiner acknowledged to the undersigned attorney that, subject to further searching, the foregoing amendment to Claim 1 would place all of the finally rejected Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 15 in a condition for allowance.

Finally, in view of their dependence from allowable Claim 1, objected-to Claims 2, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are seen to clearly be in a condition for allowance without modification of any of such claims.

In view of the foregoing amendment, remarks and arguments, all of the claims currently pending in this application are now seen to be in a condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance of Claims 1-37 is therefore earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is hereby requested to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at 972/516-0030 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the instant application.

Respectfully submitted,

KONNEKER & SMITH, P.C.

J. Richard Konneker
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 28,867

Dated: February 1, 2006

660 N. Central Expwy., #230
Plano, Texas 75074
972/516-0030

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450,

on February 1, 2006
Diane Sutton